

1 Robert A. Mittelstaedt #60359  
2 ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com  
3 Craig E. Stewart #129530  
4 cestewart@jonesday.com  
5 Catherine Zeng #251231  
6 czeng@jonesday.com  
7 JONES DAY  
8 555 California Street, 26th Floor  
9 San Francisco, CA 94104  
10 Telephone: (415) 626-3939  
11 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

12 Attorneys for Defendant  
13 Intuit Inc.

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION  
17

18 IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE  
19 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

**Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK**

20 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
21  
22 ALL ACTIONS

**DEFENDANT INTUIT INC.'S  
ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS'  
CONSOLIDATED AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

**JURY DEMAND**

## ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Defendant Intuit Inc. hereby answers the Consolidated Amended Complaint (“CAC”) filed by plaintiffs Michael Devine, Mark Fichtner, Siddharth Hariharan, Brandon Marshall, and Daniel Stover (“Plaintiffs”) on September 13, 2011. Except as expressly admitted below, Intuit denies each and every allegation and claim in the CAC.

1. The allegations in Paragraph 1 are not susceptible to being answered because of their ambiguity and because they call for legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies that it engaged in any unlawful conduct or violated any law and otherwise denies the allegations in Paragraph 1.

2. The allegations in the first and second sentences of Paragraph 2 are not susceptible to being answered because of their ambiguity and because they call for legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations. Answering the allegations in the third sentence of Paragraph 2, Intuit admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring claims under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, and the Cartwright Act, California Business and Professions Code §§ 16720, et seq., but denies that it engaged in any unlawful conduct or violated any law and otherwise denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 2.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Plaintiffs withdrew their claims under California Business and Professions Code § 16600, and the Court dismissed the Plaintiffs’ claims under the California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. Order Granting In Part And Denying In Part Defendants’ Joint Motion to Dismiss; Denying Lucasfilm Ltd.’s Motion to Dismiss, 8 & n.6, 29 (Apr. 18, 2012) (Doc. 119). The Plaintiffs also withdrew their prayer for injunctive declaratory relief. *Id.* at 8 n.7.

1           3.       Answering the allegations in the first sentence of Paragraph 3, Intuit admits that  
2 the DOJ conducted an investigation of Defendants' recruiting practices between 2009 and 2010  
3 but otherwise denies the allegations. Intuit denies the allegations in the second and third  
4 sentences that the DOJ made factual or legal findings. The quoted text are unproven allegations  
5 made by the DOJ in the Complaint filed in *United States v. Adobe Sys. Inc., Apple Inc., Google*  
6 *Inc., Intel Corp., Intuit, Inc. & Pixar*, No. 1:10-cv-01629-RBW (D.D.C. Sept. 24, 2010) (Doc. 1)  
7 [hereinafter "DOJ Complaint"]. That case was resolved "without trial or adjudication of any  
8 issue of fact or law." *United States v. Adobe Sys. Inc., Apple Inc., Google Inc., Intel Corp., Intuit,*  
9 *Inc. & Pixar*, No. 1:10-cv-01629-RBW (D.D.C. Mar. 18, 2011) (Doc. 17), pp. 2-3. Intuit denies  
10 that it engaged in any unlawful conduct or violated any law, denies each allegation in the quoted  
11 text, and otherwise denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 3.

12           4.       The allegations in the first sentence of Paragraph 4 are not susceptible to being  
13 answered because of their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the  
14 allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
15 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the  
16 extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies  
17 that employees were injured by any alleged agreement involving Intuit. Intuit otherwise lacks  
18 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in the first  
19 sentence of Paragraph 4 and on that basis denies the allegations. Intuit denies the remaining  
20 allegations in Paragraph 4.

21           5.       Answering the allegations in Paragraph 5, Intuit admits that Plaintiffs seek  
22 damages and purport to bring claims under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, and the  
23 Cartwright Act, California Business and Professions Code §§ 16720, et seq., but denies that it  
24 violated any law and otherwise denies the allegations in Paragraph 5. To the extent that the  
25 allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
26 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them.

27           6.       The allegations in Paragraph 6 state legal conclusions to which no answer is  
28 necessary.

1           7.       The allegations in Paragraph 7 state legal conclusions to which no answer is  
2 necessary. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at  
3 other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
4 as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is  
5 deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that it conducts business  
6 and is headquartered in the Northern District of California and that venue is proper to the extent  
7 that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction and otherwise denies the allegations in Paragraph 7.

8           8.       The allegations in Paragraph 8 state legal conclusions to which no answer is  
9 necessary. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at  
10 other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief  
11 as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is  
12 deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that the Northern District  
13 of California has personal jurisdiction over it for the purposes of this action but otherwise denies  
14 the remaining allegations in Paragraph 8.

15           9.       The allegations in Paragraph 9 state legal conclusions to which no answer is  
16 necessary. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary, Intuit denies the allegations in  
17 Paragraph 9.

18           10.      The allegations in Paragraph 10 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
19 their ambiguity and because they state legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the  
20 extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or  
21 third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
22 allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and  
23 the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 10.

24           11.      The allegations in Paragraph 11 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
25 their ambiguity and because they state legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the  
26 extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or  
27 third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
28

1 allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and  
2 the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 11.

3 12. The allegations in Paragraph 12 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
4 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
5 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
6 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
7 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that its employment  
8 relationship with Mr. Stover was in Santa Clara County, California. Intuit otherwise lacks  
9 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in  
10 Paragraph 12 and on that basis denies the allegations.

11 13. To the extent that the allegations in Paragraph 13 are directed at other defendants  
12 or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
13 the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that the allegations are directed at  
14 Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 13.

15 14. The allegations in Paragraph 14 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
16 their ambiguity and because they state legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the  
17 extent an answer is deemed necessary, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 14.

18 15. The allegations in Paragraph 15 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
19 their ambiguity and because they state legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the  
20 extent an answer is deemed necessary, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 15.

21 16. Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
22 the allegations in Paragraph 16 and on that basis denies the allegations.

23 17. Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
24 the allegations in Paragraph 17 and on that basis denies the allegations.

25 18. Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
26 the allegations in Paragraph 18 and on that basis denies the allegations.

27 19. Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
28 the allegations in Paragraph 19 and on that basis denies the allegations.

1           20.     Answering the allegation in Paragraph 20, Intuit admits that from October 2006 to  
2     December 2009, Mr. Stover was employed in the County of Santa Clara by Intuit, and that during  
3     a portion of that period his job title was software engineer. Intuit denies that Mr. Stover was  
4     injured in his business or property by reason of the allegations in the CAC. Intuit otherwise lacks  
5     knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in  
6     Paragraph 20 and on that basis denies the allegations.

7           21.     Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
8     the allegations in Paragraph 21 and on that basis denies the allegations.

9           22.     Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
10    the allegations in Paragraph 22 and on that basis denies the allegations.

11          23.     Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
12    the allegations in Paragraph 23 and on that basis denies the allegations.

13          24.     Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
14    the allegations in Paragraph 24 and on that basis denies the allegations.

15          25.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 25, Intuit admits that it is a Delaware  
16    corporation and that its principal place of business is in Mountain View, California. Intuit  
17    otherwise denies the allegations in Paragraph 25.

18          26.     Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
19    the allegations in Paragraph 26 and on that basis denies the allegations.

20          27.     Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of  
21    the allegations in Paragraph 27 and on that basis denies the allegations.

22          28.     The allegations in Paragraph 28 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
23    their ambiguity and because they call for legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To  
24    the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants  
25    or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
26    the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary  
27    and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 28.  
28

1           29.     The allegations in Paragraph 29 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
2     their ambiguity and because they call for legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To  
3     the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants  
4     or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
5     the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary  
6     and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 29.

7           30.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 30, Intuit admits that Plaintiffs purport to  
8     bring this action on behalf of themselves and others. Intuit denies that Plaintiffs have established  
9     or can establish the prerequisites to certification and/or maintenance of the alleged classes  
10    pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and otherwise denies the allegations  
11    in Paragraph 30.

12          31.     Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 31.

13          32.     Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 32.

14          33.     Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 33.

15          34.     Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 34.

16          35.     Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 35.

17          36.     Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 36.

18          37.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 37, Plaintiffs have withdrawn their request  
19    for injunctive relief, so no answer is necessary. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary  
20    and the allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or  
21    information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies  
22    them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit,  
23    Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 37.

24          38.     Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 38.

25          39.     The allegations in Paragraph 39 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
26    their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
27    at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
28    belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer

1 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that it employed  
2 people in the United States, in California, and in the Northern District of California during the  
3 period of January 1, 2005 through January 1, 2010 and otherwise denies the allegations in  
4 Paragraph 39.

5 40. The allegations in Paragraph 40 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
6 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
7 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
8 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
9 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
10 Paragraph 40.

11 41. The allegations in Paragraph 41 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
12 their ambiguity and because they call for legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To  
13 the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants  
14 or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
15 the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary  
16 and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that cold calling is one recruiting technique.  
17 Intuit denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 41.

18 42. The allegations in Paragraph 42 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
19 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
20 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
21 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
22 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
23 Paragraph 42.

24 43. The allegations in Paragraph 43 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
25 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
26 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
27 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
28



1 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
2 Paragraph 43.

3 44. The allegations in Paragraph 44 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
4 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
5 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
6 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
7 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
8 Paragraph 44.

9 45. The allegations in Paragraph 45 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
10 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
11 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
12 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
13 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that cold calling is one  
14 recruiting technique used by Intuit and otherwise denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph  
15 45.

16 46. The allegations in the first and second sentences of Paragraph 46 are not  
17 susceptible to being answered because of their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed  
18 necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks  
19 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that  
20 basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are  
21 directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in the first and second sentences. Answering the  
22 remaining allegations in Paragraph 46, Intuit admits that an employee may attempt to use an offer  
23 from another firm to negotiate increased compensation from her current employer and otherwise  
24 denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 46.

25 47. The allegations in Paragraph 47 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
26 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
27 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
28 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer

1 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit lacks knowledge or  
2 information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 47 and on  
3 that basis denies the allegations.

4 48. The allegations in Paragraph 48 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
5 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
6 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
7 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
8 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
9 Paragraph 48.

10 49. The allegations in Paragraph 49 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
11 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
12 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
13 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
14 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
15 Paragraph 49.

16 50. The allegations in Paragraph 50 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
17 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
18 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
19 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
20 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
21 Paragraph 50.

22 51. The allegations in Paragraph 51 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
23 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
24 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
25 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
26 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that it monitors and  
27 manages compensation levels to achieve certain goals, including: maintaining employee morale  
28

1 and productivity; retaining employees; and attracting new employees. Intuit otherwise denies the  
2 allegations in Paragraph 51.

3 52. The allegations in Paragraph 52 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
4 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
5 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
6 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
7 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
8 Paragraph 52.

9 53. The allegations in Paragraph 53 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
10 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
11 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
12 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
13 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
14 Paragraph 53.

15 54. The allegations in Paragraph 54 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
16 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
17 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
18 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
19 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
20 Paragraph 54.

21 55. The allegations in Paragraph 55 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
22 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
23 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
24 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
25 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
26 Paragraph 55.

27 56. The allegations in Paragraph 56 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
28 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed

1 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
2 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
3 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
4 Paragraph 56.

5 57. The allegations in Paragraph 57 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
6 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
7 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
8 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
9 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
10 Paragraph 57.

11 58. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 58, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
12 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 58 and on that basis  
13 denies the allegations.

14 59. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 59, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
15 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 59 and on that basis  
16 denies the allegations.

17 60. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 60, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
18 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 60 and on that basis  
19 denies the allegations.

20 61. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 61, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
21 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 61 and on that basis  
22 denies the allegations.

23 62. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 62, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
24 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 62 and on that basis  
25 denies the allegations.

26 63. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 63, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
27 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 63 and on that basis  
28 denies the allegations.

1           64.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 64, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
2 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 64 and on that basis  
3 denies the allegations.

4           65.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 65, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
5 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 65 and on that basis  
6 denies the allegations.

7           66.     The allegations in Paragraph 66 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
8 their ambiguity and because they call for legal conclusions. To the extent that an answer is  
9 deemed necessary, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the  
10 truth of the allegations in Paragraph 66 and on that basis denies the allegations.

11          67.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 67, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
12 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 67 and on that basis  
13 denies the allegations.

14          68.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 68, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
15 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 68 and on that basis  
16 denies the allegations.

17          69.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 69, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
18 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 69 and on that basis  
19 denies the allegations.

20          70.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 70, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
21 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 70 and on that basis  
22 denies the allegations.

23          71.     Answering the allegations of Paragraph 71, to the extent that the allegations are  
24 directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
25 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that the  
26 allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 71.

27  
28

1           72.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 72, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
2 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 72 and on that basis  
3 denies the allegations.

4           73.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 73, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
5 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 73 and on that basis  
6 denies the allegations.

7           74.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 74, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
8 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 74 and on that basis  
9 denies the allegations.

10          75.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 75, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
11 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 75 and on that basis  
12 denies the allegations.

13          76.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 76, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
14 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 76 and on that basis  
15 denies the allegations.

16          77.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 77, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
17 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 77 and on that basis  
18 denies the allegations.

19          78.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 78, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
20 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 78 and on that basis  
21 denies the allegations.

22          79.     The allegations in Paragraph 79 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
23 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
24 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
25 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
26 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies that there was a  
27 conspiracy and otherwise denies the allegations in Paragraph 79.  
28

1           80.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 80, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
2 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 80 and on that basis  
3 denies the allegations.

4           81.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 81, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
5 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 81 and on that basis  
6 denies the allegations.

7           82.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 82, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
8 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 82 and on that basis  
9 denies the allegations.

10          83.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 83, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
11 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 83 and on that basis  
12 denies the allegations.

13          84.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 84, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
14 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 84 and on that basis  
15 denies the allegations.

16          85.     The allegations in Paragraph 85 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
17 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
18 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
19 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
20 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
21 Paragraph 85.

22          86.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 86, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
23 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 86 and on that basis  
24 denies the allegations.

25          87.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 87, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
26 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 87 and on that basis  
27 denies the allegations.  
28

1           88.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 88, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
2 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 88 and on that basis  
3 denies the allegations.

4           89.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 89, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
5 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 89 and on that basis  
6 denies the allegations.

7           90.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 90, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
8 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 90 and on that basis  
9 denies the allegations.

10          91.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 91, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
11 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 91 and on that basis  
12 denies the allegations.

13          92.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 92, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
14 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 92 and on that basis  
15 denies the allegations.

16          93.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 93, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
17 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 93 and on that basis  
18 denies the allegations.

19          94.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 94, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
20 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 94 and on that basis  
21 denies the allegations.

22          95.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 95, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
23 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 95 and on that basis  
24 denies the allegations.

25          96.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 96, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
26 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 96 and on that basis  
27 denies the allegations.  
28



1           97.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 97, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
2 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 97 and on that basis  
3 denies the allegations.

4           98.     The allegations in Paragraph 98 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
5 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
6 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
7 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
8 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
9 Paragraph 98.

10          99.     Answering the allegations in Paragraph 99, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
11 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 99 and on that basis  
12 denies the allegations.

13          100.    Answering the allegations in Paragraph 100, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
14 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 100 and on that basis  
15 denies the allegations.

16          101.    Answering the allegations in Paragraph 101, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
17 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 101 and on that basis  
18 denies the allegations.

19          102.    Answering the allegations in Paragraph 102, Intuit lacks knowledge or information  
20 sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 102 and on that basis  
21 denies the allegations.

22          103.    Intuit denies the allegations in the first sentence of Paragraph 103. Intuit lacks  
23 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second  
24 sentence of Paragraph 103 and on that basis denies them.

25          104.    Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 104.

26          105.    Answering the allegations in Paragraph 105, to the extent that the allegations are  
27 directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
28

1 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that the  
2 allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 105.

3 106. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 106, to the extent that the allegations are  
4 directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
5 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that the  
6 allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 106.

7 107. Answering the allegations in Paragraph 107, to the extent that the allegations are  
8 directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
9 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that the  
10 allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 107.

11 108. The allegations in Paragraph 108 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
12 their ambiguity and because they state conclusions of law to which no answer is necessary. To  
13 the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants  
14 or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
15 the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary  
16 and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 108.

17 109. The allegations in Paragraph 109 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
18 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
19 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
20 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
21 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
22 Paragraph 109.

23 110. The allegations in Paragraph 110 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
24 their ambiguity and because they state conclusions of law to which no answer is necessary. To  
25 the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants  
26 or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
27 the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary  
28 and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 110.

111. The allegations in Paragraph 111 are not susceptible to being answered because of their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits that the DOJ conducted an investigation related to certain employment practices of defendants, and it admits that the DOJ issued a Civil Investigative Demand to Intuit and that Intuit produced documents to the DOJ. Intuit otherwise denies the allegations in Paragraph 111.

112. The allegations in Paragraph 112 are not susceptible to being answered because of their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit lacks knowledge or information about the DOJ's actual conclusions and on that basis denies the allegations. Intuit denies the allegations in the second and third sentences that the DOJ made factual or legal findings. The quoted text are unproven allegations made by the DOJ in the Complaint filed in *United States v. Adobe Sys. Inc., Apple Inc., Google Inc., Intel Corp., Intuit, Inc. & Pixar*, No. 1:10-cv-01629-RBW (D.D.C. Sept. 24, 2010) (Doc. 1). That case was resolved "without trial or adjudication of any issue of fact or law." *United States v. Adobe Sys. Inc., Apple Inc., Google Inc., Intel Corp., Intuit, Inc. & Pixar*, No. 1:10-cv-01629-RBW (D.D.C. Mar. 18, 2011) (Doc. 17), pp. 2-3. Intuit denies that it engaged in any unlawful conduct or violated any law, denies each allegation in the quoted text, and otherwise denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 112.

113. The allegations in Paragraph 113 are not susceptible to being answered because of their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit lacks knowledge or

1 information about the DOJ's actual conclusions and on that basis denies the allegations. The  
2 quoted text are unproven allegations made by the DOJ in the Complaint filed in *United States v.*  
3 *Adobe Sys. Inc., Apple Inc., Google Inc., Intel Corp., Intuit, Inc. & Pixar*, No. 1:10-cv-01629-  
4 RBW (D.D.C. Sept. 24, 2010) (Doc. 1). Intuit denies that it engaged in any unlawful conduct or  
5 violated any law, denies each allegation in the quoted text, and otherwise denies the remaining  
6 allegations in Paragraph 113.

7 114. Answering the allegations in the first and second sentences of Paragraph 114,  
8 Intuit admits that that the DOJ filed complaints against Adobe, Apple, Google, Intel, Intuit, and  
9 Pixar on September 24, 2010 and against Lucasfilm and Pixar on December 21, 2010 regarding  
10 bilateral non-solicit agreements. Answering the allegations in the third sentence of Paragraph  
11 114, Intuit admits that the final judgment entered in the case states that "[t]he Complaint states a  
12 claim upon which relief may be granted against the Defendants." Intuit otherwise denies the  
13 allegations in Paragraph 114.

14 115. The allegations in Paragraph 115 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
15 their ambiguity and because they state conclusions of law to which no answer is necessary. To  
16 the extent that an answer is deemed necessary, Intuit answers that the Final Judgments speak for  
17 themselves and otherwise denies the allegations in Paragraph 115.

18 116. The allegations in Paragraph 116 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
19 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
20 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
21 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
22 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit denies the allegations in  
23 Paragraph 116.

24 117. The allegations in Paragraph 117 are not susceptible to being answered because of  
25 their ambiguity. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed  
26 at other defendants or third-parties, Intuit lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
27 belief as to the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies them. To the extent that an answer  
28 is deemed necessary and the allegations are directed at Intuit, Intuit admits the DOJ did not

1 pursue monetary penalties from the Defendants. Intuit otherwise denies the allegations in  
2 Paragraph 117.

3 118. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 118.

4 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 119. Intuit repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 118 as if fully set  
6 forth herein.

7 120. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 120.

8 121. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 121.

9 122. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 122.

10 123. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 123.

11 124. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 124.

12 125. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 125.

13 126. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 126.

14 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 127. Intuit repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 126 as if fully set  
16 forth herein.

17 128. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 128.

18 129. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 129.

19 130. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 130.

20 131. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 131.

21 132. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 132.

22 133. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 133.

23 134. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 134.

24 135. Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraph 135.

25 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

26 Paragraphs 136 through 143 of the Consolidated Amended Complaint consist of  
27 Plaintiffs' withdrawn Third Claim for Relief under California Business and Professions Code  
28

1 § 16600, to which no response is necessary. To the extent that an answer is deemed necessary,  
2 Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraphs 136 through 143.

3 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

4 Paragraphs 144 through 152 of the Consolidated Amended Complaint consist of  
5 Plaintiffs' dismisses Fourth Claim for Relief under California Business and Professions Code §§  
6 17200, et seq., to which no response is necessary. To the extent that an answer is deemed  
7 necessary, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraphs 144 through 152.

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 The remaining Paragraphs 153 through 164 of the Consolidated Amended Complaint  
10 consist of Plaintiffs' Prayer For Relief to which no response is necessary. To the extent that an  
11 answer is deemed necessary, Intuit denies the allegations in Paragraphs 153 through 164.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Intuit sets forth below its affirmative defenses. Each defense is asserted as to all claims against Intuit. By setting forth these affirmative defenses, Intuit does not assume the burden of proving any fact, issue, or element of a cause of action where such burden properly belongs to the Plaintiffs. Moreover, nothing stated herein is intended or shall be construed as an admission that any particular issue or subject matter is relevant to the Plaintiffs' allegations.

Intuit reserves the right to amend or supplement its affirmative defenses and raise counterclaims as additional facts concerning its defenses become known to it.

As separate and distinct affirmative defenses, Intuit alleges as follows:

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' Consolidated Amended Complaint, in whole or in part, fails to state any claim upon which relief can be granted against Intuit.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Plaintiffs and/or others claimed to be members of the putative class lack standing to assert their claims and/or to seek some or all of the requested relief.

### THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Plaintiffs and/or putative class members have sustained no injury in fact or damages caused by any act or omission of Intuit.

## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred, in whole or in part, because they have not suffered and will not suffer any injury that is cognizable under the antitrust laws.

## FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Intuit's alleged activities do not give rise to antitrust liability, because they did not result in adverse effects on competition or, in the alternative, any such effects were outweighed by the pro-competitive benefits of the activities.

## SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred, in whole or in part,

1 because Intuit has at all times and in all relevant matters acted reasonably, serving legitimate  
2 business purposes, in furtherance of trade, in good faith, and with the purpose and effect of  
3 promoting, encouraging, or increasing competition. Intuit has not acted with the purpose or intent  
4 to suppress or restrain competition.

5 **SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

6 The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred, in whole or in part,  
7 because any of Intuit's acts or practices that are the subject of the Consolidated Amended  
8 Complaint were economically justified and resulted from a good-faith effort to meet competition  
9 or market conditions.

10 **EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

11 The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by  
12 the applicable statutes of limitations and/or the doctrine of laches.

13 **NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

14 The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred, in whole or in part,  
15 under the doctrines of waiver and/or estoppel.

16 **TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

17 The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred, in whole or in part,  
18 because the alleged damages sought are too speculative and uncertain and because of the  
19 impossibility of ascertaining and allocating those damages.

20 **ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

21 The Plaintiffs and/or putative class members are barred from recovery of any damages  
22 because of and to the extent of their failure to mitigate damages.

23 **TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

24 Intuit is entitled to set off of any amounts paid to the Plaintiffs and/or putative class  
25 members by any defendants other than Intuit, including defendants who settle.

26 **THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

27 The Consolidated Amended Complaint fails to allege fraudulent concealment with  
28 particularity.



**FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred to the extent that they agreed to arbitration or chose a different forum for the resolution of their claims.

**FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Any injuries or damages the Plaintiffs and/or putative class members suffered were caused solely and proximately by the acts and omissions of others.

**SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

To the extent that any actionable conduct occurred, the Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims against Intuit are barred because all such conduct would have been committed by individuals acting ultra vires.

**SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The Plaintiffs' and/or putative class members' claims are barred, in whole or in part due to release, discharge, and/or settlement.

**EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Intuit adopts by reference any applicable defense pleaded by any other defendant not otherwise expressly set forth herein.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Intuit prays as follows:

1. That Plaintiffs take nothing by reason of their Consolidated Amended Complaint, and that judgment be rendered in favor of Intuit.
2. That the Court dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaint in its entirety, with prejudice;
3. That Intuit be awarded its costs of suit and attorney's fees incurred in this action (including all costs and fees associated with collecting, processing, and reviewing documents including electronically stored information), to the maximum extent permitted by law; and
4. For such other relief as the Court deems proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Intuit hereby demands trial by jury in this action on all matters triable to a jury.

Dated: May 21, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

By: /s/Craig E. Stewart

Craig E. Stewart

Robert A. Mittelstaedt #60359  
ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com  
Craig E. Stewart #129530  
cestewart@jonesday.com  
Catherine Zeng #251231  
czeng@jonesday.com  
555 California Street, 26th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 626-3939  
Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

Attorneys for Defendant Intuit Inc.

SFI-733229v1